		NORTHERN DIST	S DISTRICT COURT RICT OF CALIFORNIA CISCO DIVISION	FILED
United States	s of America,	)	Case No. CR 16-56	AUG 0 1 2016
	Plaintiff, v.	)	STIPULATED ORDER EX UNDER THE SPEEDY TR	CLUDANGNTARBONG LACLERALUS DISTRICT COURT MORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
Rusty		)		
	Defendant.	)		
under the Speends of justic	eedy Trial Act from se served by the co See 18 U.S.C. § 3	n Ayyut 1	the best interest of the public and Court makes this finding and bases	nd finds that the the defendant in a
	re to grant a continu B U.S.C. § 3161(h)		ly to result in a miscarriage of just	ice.
defend or law	dants, the nay, that it is unreason	ture of the prosecut hable to expect adec	icheck applicable reasons]tion, or the existence of nov quate preparation for pretrial processis section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(1)	el questions of fact edings or the trial
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
couns	<u> </u>	d case commitment	onably deny the defendant continues, taking into account the exercise	• • •
necess	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
IT IS	S SO ORDERED.			
DATED: <u></u>	1/16			
			JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge	
			10/1.	·
STIPULATED			1/m//	

Assistant United States Attorney

Attorney for Defendant